Fermion confinement via Quantum Walks

I. Márquez-Martín[1], G. Di Molfetta[1,2],* and A. Pérez[1]
[1] *Departamento de Física Teórica and IFIC, Universidad de Valencia-CSIC, Dr. Moliner 50, 46100-Burjassot, Spain and*
[2] *Aix-Marseille Université, CNRS, Laboratoire d'Informatique Fondamentale, Marseille, France*

We analyze the properties of a two dimensional quantum walk that are inspired by the idea of a brane-world model put forward by Rubakov and Shaposhnikov [1]. In that model, particles are dynamically confined on the brane due to the interaction with a scalar field. We translated this model into an alternate quantum walk with a coin that depends on the external field, with a dependence which mimics a domain wall solution. As in the original model, fermions (in our case, the walker), become localized in one of the dimensions, not from the action of a random noise on the lattice (as in the case of Anderson localization), but from a regular dependence in space. On the other hand, the resulting quantum walk can move freely along the "ordinary" dimension.

arXiv:1612.08027v1 [quant-ph] 23 Dec 2016

I. INTRODUCTION

The quantum walk (QW) is the quantum analogue of the classical random walk. As in the case of random walks, QWs can appear either under its discrete-time [2] or continuous-time [3] form. We will concentrate here on discrete-time QWs, first considered by Grössing and Zeilinger [4] in 1988, as simple one-particle quantum cellular automata, and later popularized in the physics community in 1993, by Y. Aharonov [2]. The dynamics of such QWs consists on a quantum particle taking steps on a lattice conditioned on its internal state, typically a (pseudo) spin one half system. The particle dynamically explores a large Hilbert space associated with the positions of the lattice and allows thus to simulate a wide range of transport phenomena [5]. With QWs, the transport is driven by an external discrete unitary operation, which sets it apart from other lattice quantum simulation concepts where transport typically rests on tunneling between adjacent sites [6]: all dynamic processes are discrete in space and time. It has been shown that any quantum algorithm can be recast under the form of a QW on a certain graph: QWs can be used for universal quantum computation, this being provable for both the continuous [7] and the discrete version [8]. As models of coherent quantum transport, they are interesting both for fundamental quantum physics and for applications. An important field of applications is quantum algorithmic [9]. QWs were first conceived as a natural tool to explore graphs, for example for efficient data searching (see e.g. [10]). They are also useful in condensed matter applications and topological phases [11]. A totally new emergent point of view concerning QWs concerns quantum simulation of gauge fields and high-energy physical laws [12–14]. It is important to note that QWs can be realized experimentally with a wide range of physical objects and setups, for example as transport of photons in optical networks or optical fibers [15], or of atoms in optical lattices [16].

Within the context of diffusion processes in lattices, spatial localization appears as a natural phenomenon. It can result from random noise on the lattice sites, giving rise to Anderson localization [17], but it can also be driven by the action of an external periodic potential (see e.g. [18–20]). Similarly, one obtains localization for the 1-dimensional QW when spatial disorder is included [21–23], via non-linear effects [24], or using a spatially periodic coin [25]. For higher dimensions, localization may appear, even in the noiseless case, from the choice of the coin operator [26].

In this paper, we will propose a different variant of the QW that gives rise to localization, by introducing a site-dependent non-periodic coin operator. The model is inspired on a brane-world proposal with extra dimensions [1], where particles are confined to live in the ordinary 3+1 dimensions by the action of a potential well created by some additional scalar field. In its simplest form, one accounts for massless fermions which are confined in the brane. This idea can be translated to describe a QW where the potential well manifests as a position-dependent coin operator. Differently to the situations describe above, the confining field is not random nor periodic, being instead a monotonous function of the position. As we show, this kind of QW produces a dynamical localization of the QW as in the original model. In fact, it can be shown that, in the continuous space-time limit, one reproduces the dynamics of a massless Dirac fermion. In this way, we establish an interesting parallelism between a high-energy quantum

* giuseppe.dimolfetta@lif.univ-mrs.fr

field theory, and a QW model that results in localization.

The rest of this paper is organized as follows. In Sect. II we briefly introduce the original brane model [1] that motivated our work. In Sect. III we make use of this model to introduce a QW on two dimensions with a position-dependent coin that simulates the domain wall "scalar field" along the second (or "extra dimension"). We show that this QW in fact results in a confinement of the walker, and that the space-time continuous limit indeed reproduces the dynamics of a Dirac particle coupled to the scalar field. Sect. IV is devoted to summarizing and discussing our results.

II. DOMAIN WALL MODEL FOR PARTICLE PHYSICS

The possibility of extra dimensions of space was first suggested by Theodor Kaluza and Oscar Klein [27, 28] seeking for an unified theory of electromagnetic and gravitational fields into a higher dimensional field, with one of the dimensions compactified. However, experimental data from particle colliders restrict the compactification radius to such small scales that they become virtually impossible to access them experimentally. A way to overcome this difficulty [29] makes use of the ideas put forward by Rubakov and Shaposhnikov [1]. In that paper, the authors propose a brane world scenario, in which space-time has $(3+N)+1$ dimensions, with ordinary (low energy) particles confined in a potential well which is narrow along N spatial directions and flat along the remaining three directions. The origin of this potential well is suggested to have a dynamical origin. In the simplest case it can be created by an extra scalar field in $4+1$ dimensions, as described by the Lagrangian

$$\mathcal{L} = \frac{1}{2}\partial_A\partial^A\varphi - \frac{1}{2}m^2\varphi - \frac{1}{4}\lambda\varphi^4, \quad A = 0,1,2,3,4, \quad (1)$$

with metrics $g_{AB} = (1,-1,-1,-1,-1)$. The classical equations of motion derived from the above Lagrangian admit a domain wall solution $\varphi(x^4)$ that only depends on the coordinate x^4 along the extra dimension, and is given by

$$\varphi(x^4) = \frac{m}{\sqrt{\lambda}}\tanh(\frac{mx^4}{\sqrt{2}}). \quad (2)$$

This model can account for left-handed massless fermions living in $3+1$ dimensions, if they are coupled to the scalar fields, as in the following Lagrangian:

$$\mathcal{L}_\psi = i\bar{\Psi}\Gamma^A\partial_A\Psi + h\varphi\bar{\Psi}\Psi, \quad (3)$$

where h is the coupling constant, and the $4+1$-dimensional gamma matrices are $\Gamma^\mu = \gamma^\mu$, $\mu = 0,\dots 3$, and $\Gamma^4 = i\gamma^5$, with γ^μ, γ^5 the standard gamma matrices. From Eq. (3) the corresponding Dirac equation follows, which reads

$$i\Gamma^A\partial_A\Psi + h\varphi\Psi = 0. \quad (4)$$

As discussed in [1], this equation has a solution that is confined inside the domain wall, while the corresponding particles are left-handed massless fermions in the $3+1$ dimensional world. In the next Section, we make use of this ideas to introduce a QW model in $1+1+1$ dimensions that leads to confined fermions in $1+1$.

III. QUANTUM WALKS INSIDE A DOMAIN WALL

Consider a QW defined over discrete time and discrete two-dimensional space, with axis x, y. The discrete space points are labeled by p and q, respectively, with $p, q \in \mathbb{Z}$, while time steps are labeled by $j \in \mathbb{N}$. This QW is driven by an in-homogeneous coin acting on the 2-dimensional Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}_{\text{spin}}$. The evolution equations read

$$\begin{bmatrix}\psi^\uparrow_{j+1,p,q}\\ \psi^\downarrow_{j+1,p,q}\end{bmatrix} = S_yQ^+(\theta_q)S_xQ^-(\theta_q)\begin{bmatrix}\psi^\uparrow_{j,p,q}\\ \psi^\downarrow_{j,p,q}\end{bmatrix}, \quad (5)$$

with $Q^\pm(\theta_q)$ defined as

$$Q^\pm(\theta_q) = \begin{pmatrix}\cos\theta^\pm_q & i\sin\theta^\pm_q\\ i\sin\theta^\pm_q & \cos\theta^\pm_q\end{pmatrix}, \quad (6)$$

where $\theta^\pm_q = \pm\frac{\pi}{4} - \epsilon\bar{\theta}_q$ is the coin angle, which depends only on the coordinate q, and ϵ is a small parameter that allows to reach the appropriate continuous space-time limit (see discussion below). The operators S^x and S^y are the usual spin-dependent translations along the x-direction and the y-direction, respectively. They are defined as follows:

$$S^x\Psi_{j,p,q} = \left(\psi^\uparrow_{j,p+1,q}, \psi^\downarrow_{j,p-1,q}\right)^\top. \quad (7)$$

and

$$S^y\Psi_{j,p,q} = \left(\psi^\uparrow_{j,p,q+1}, \psi^\downarrow_{j,p,q-1}\right)^\top. \quad (8)$$



Figure 1. (Color online) Probability distribution $||\Psi(t_j, x_p, y_q)||^2$ of the two-dimensional QW for a value $t = 10$ of the timestep, and different values of m. The rest of parameters are fixed to $\lambda = 60$, $h = 70$, with the lattice parameter $\epsilon = 0.04$. The inset in the last subfigure also shows the density profile along each direction of the lattice (*red dot-dashed line* represents the x-direction and *blue dashed line* the y-direction). The initial condition is a Gaussian wave packet $\Psi(0, x_p, y_q) = \sqrt{n(x_p, y_q)} \otimes (\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}, \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}})^\top$ centered at the point $(64, 64)$, where the gaussian distribution $n(x_p, y_q)$ has a width $\delta = 0.1$.



Figure 2. (Color online) Time evolution of the standard deviation divided by the timestep, i.e., $\sigma_x(t)/t$ (in the inset) and $\sigma_y(t)/t$, calculated independently along the x and y directions, for a localised (red diamonds) and a free fermion (blue squares). The initial condition is a Gaussian wave packet $\Psi(0, x_p, y_q) = \sqrt{n(x_p, y_q)} \otimes (0, 1)^\top$ centered around $(128, 128)$, and the parameters of the potential are $\lambda = 60$ and $h = 70$, with the lattice parameter $\epsilon = 0.02$.

Equations (5) describe the evolution of a two-level system, e.g., a fermion in two dimensions, and it has been shown that each of them recover, in the continuous limit, the Dirac equation [30], where the parameter θ_q corresponds to a position-dependent potential. Let us now consider $\bar{\theta}_q$ of the form:

$$\bar{\theta}_q = h\frac{m}{\sqrt{\lambda}}\tanh(\frac{mq}{\sqrt{2}}), \tag{9}$$

and notice that it corresponds to a narrow potential in the q-direction when m, the "effective mass" is sufficiently large.

Fig. 1 shows the evolved probability distribution of this 2D QW, starting from a symmetric Gaussian profile in both directions. As the mass is increased, the probability becomes strongly localized on the $y-$axis, while it evolves as a usual QW on the non-confining $x-$direction. This features are clearly seen in Fig. 2, where we have represented the standard deviation divided by the timestep, i.e., $\sigma_x(t)/t$ and $\sigma_y(t)/t$, calculated independently along the x and y directions. For $m = 0$ (no confinement), both quotients tend to a constant, which corresponds to the normal spreading of a 2D QW in both directions. As m increases, localization acts on the y- direction, and manifests as an exponential decay of $\sigma_y(t)/t$. On the other hand, the standard deviation corresponding to the x axis behaves as a free-evolving QW, with a spreading velocity that depends on the parameters of the potential well.

As we show below, in the continuous limit equations (5) are in correspondence with Eq. (4), describing the propagation of a massless fermion in a space-time manifold $M^{(1+N,1)}$, the usual Minkowski space with $1 + N$ spatial dimensions. When m is non-vanishing, the fermion is confined inside a potential well, which is sufficiently narrow along N directions and flat along the other one (in our case $N = 1$).

Let us introduce new space-time coordinates t_j, x_p and y_q such that $t_j = j\epsilon$, $x_p = p\epsilon$ and $y_q = q\epsilon$. In the limit when $\varepsilon \longrightarrow 0$, these coordinates become continuous, labeled by t, x and y, respectively. If we Taylor expand equations (5) around $\epsilon = 0$ we recover the fol-

lowing equation:

$$\partial_t \Psi(t,x,y) = \left[\sigma_z \partial_x - \sigma_y \partial_y - i\sigma_x \bar{\theta}(y)\right] \Psi(t,x,y), \tag{10}$$

which can be recast in covariant form:

$$i\Gamma^A \partial_A \Psi + h\frac{m}{\sqrt{\lambda}} \tanh(\frac{my}{\sqrt{2}})\Psi = 0, \tag{11}$$

where $\Gamma^A = \{\gamma^\mu, \gamma^c\}$, $\mu = 0, 1$ and $\gamma^c = i\gamma^5 = i\gamma^0\gamma^1 = -i\sigma_z$. In this equation, $\gamma^0 = -\sigma_x$, $\gamma^1 = -i\sigma_y$. As can be easily seen, Eq. (11) takes the same form as (4) if we make the identification $x^4 \longrightarrow y$ and $\varphi \longrightarrow \frac{m}{\sqrt{\lambda}} \tanh(\frac{my}{\sqrt{2}})$.

IV. DISCUSSION

In this paper we have studied the properties of a two dimensional QW that are inspired by the idea of a brane-world model put forward by Rubakov and Shaposhnikov [1]. In that model, particles are dynamically confined in the brane due to the interaction with a scalar field. We translated this model into an alternate QW with a coin that depends on the external field, with a dependence which mimics a domain wall solution. As in the original model, fermions (in our case, the walker), become confined in one of the dimensions, while they can move freely on the "ordinary" dimension. In this way, we can think of the QW as a possibility to simulate brane models of quantum field theories. In the opposite direction of thought, we obtain a QW that shows localization, not from random noise on the lattice or from a periodic coin, as in previous models, but from a coin which changes in space in a regular, non periodic, manner. In our opinion, this interplay between QWs and high energy theories can be beneficial for both fields.

V. ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This work has been supported by the Spanish Ministerio de Educación e Innovación, MICIN-FEDER project FPA2014-54459-P, SEV-2014-0398 and Generalitat Valenciana grant GVPROMETEOII2014-087.

[1] V. Rubakov and M. Shaposhnikov, Physics Letters B **125**, 136 (1983).
[2] N. Z. Y. Aharonov, L. Davidovich, Physical Review A **48**, 1687 (1993), arXiv:1207.4535v1.
[3] E. Farhi and S. Gutmann, Phys. Rev. A **58**, 915 (1998).
[4] G. Grossing and A. Zeilinger, Complex Systems **2**, 197 (1988).
[5] J. Kempe, Contemporary Physics **44**, 307 (2003), arXiv:0303081v1 [quant-ph].
[6] I. Bloch, J. Dalibard, and S. Nascimbene, Nature Physics **8**, 267 (2012).
[7] A. M. Childs, Phys. Rev. Lett. **102**, 180501 (2009).
[8] N. B. Lovett, S. Cooper, M. Everitt, M. Trevers, and V. Kendon, Phys. Rev. A **81**, 042330 (2010).
[9] A. Ambainis, International Journal of Quantum Information **1**, 507 (2003).
[10] F. Magniez, A. Nayak, J. Roland, and M. Santha, SIAM Journal on Computing **40**, 142 (2011).
[11] T. Kitagawa, M. A. Broome, A. Fedrizzi, M. S. Rudner, E. Berg, I. Kassal, A. Aspuru-Guzik, E. Demler, and A. G. White, Nature communications **3**, 882 (2012).
[12] P. Arnault, G. Di Molfetta, M. Brachet, and F. Debbasch, Phys. Rev. A **94**, 012335 (2016).
[13] M. Genske, W. Alt, A. Steffen, A. H. Werner, R. F. Werner, D. Meschede, and A. Alberti, Physical review letters **110**, 190601 (2013).
[14] G. D. Molfetta and A. Pérez, New Journal of Physics **18**, 103038 (2016).
[15] A. Schreiber, A. Gábris, P. P. Rohde, K. Laiho, M. Štefaňák, V. Potoček, C. Hamilton, I. Jex, and C. Silberhorn, Science **336**, 55 (2012).
[16] R. Côté, A. Russell, E. E. Eyler, and P. L. Gould, New Journal of Physics **8**, 156 (2006).
[17] P. W. Anderson, Phys. Rev. **109** (1956).
[18] S. Aubry and G. André, Ann. Israel Phys. Soc **3**, 18 (1980).
[19] D. R. Grempel, S. Fishman, and R. E. Prange, Phys. Rev. Lett. **49**, 833 (1982).
[20] Y. Lahini, R. Pugatch, F. Pozzi, M. Sorel, R. Morandotti, N. Davidson, and Y. Silberberg, Phys. Rev. Lett. **103**, 013901 (2009).
[21] A. Joye and M. Merkli, Journal of Statistical Physics **140**, 1025 (2010).
[22] A. Schreiber, K. N. Cassemiro, V. Potoček, A. Gábris, I. Jex, and C. Silberhorn, Phys. Rev. Lett. **106**, 180403 (2011).
[23] A. Crespi, R. Osellame, R. Ramponi, V. Giovannetti, R. Fazio, L. Sansoni, F. De Nicola, F. Sciarrino, and P. Mataloni, Nature Photonics **7**, 322 (2013), arXiv:arXiv:1304.1012v1.
[24] C. Navarrete-Benlloch, A. Pérez, and E. Roldán, Physical Review A - Atomic, Molecular, and Optical Physics **75**, 1

arXiv:0604084 [quant-ph].
[25] Y. Shikano and H. Katsura, Phys. Rev. E **82**, 031122 (2010).
[26] N. Inui, Y. Konishi, and N. Konno, Phys. Rev. A **69**, 052323 (2004).
[27] T. Kaluza, Sitzungsber. Preuss. Akad. Wiss. Berlin (Math. Phys.) **K1**, 966 (1921).
[28] O. Klein, Zeitschrift für Physik **37**, 895 (1926).
[29] N. Arkani-Hamed, S. Dimopoulos, and G. Dvali, Phys.Rev. D **59**, 086004 (1999), hep-ph/9807344.
[30] G. Di Molfetta, M. Brachet, and F. Debbasch, Physica A: Statistical Mechanics and its Applications **397**, 157 (2014).